

### **REMARKS**

**[0004]** Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application in view of the foregoing claim amendments and the following remarks. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-4 and 7-57 are currently pending
- Claims 5 and 6 were previously canceled
- Claims 1, 20, 32, 42, and 47 are amended herein

**[0005]** Support for the amendments to Claims 1, 20, 32, 42, and 47 is found in the specification in at least paragraphs [0031]. No new matter is being introduced thereby.

### **Cited Documents**

**[0006]** The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Subramanian: Subramanian et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0018775
- Griffiths: Griffiths, Laurence Kelvin, U.S. Patent No. 6,262,776

### **Claims 1-4 and 7-57 are Non-Obvious over Subramanian in view of Griffiths**

**[0007]** Claims 1-4 and 7-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Subramanian in view of Griffiths. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and further requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. However, in spite of Applicant's traversal, without acquiescing to the propriety of the

rejection, and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance of the present application, Applicant hereby amends independent Claims 1, 20, 32, 42, and 47 in the manner set forth above.

#### Independent Claim 1

**[0008]** For at least the reasons set forth below, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Subramanian and Griffiths neither teaches nor suggests at least the following features recited in independent Claim 1:

requesting, by the computing device, a second component of the pipeline to alter the manner in which the second component processes a portion of the presentation when the two or more samples are not processed at the expected time and when the first timing error is greater than the second timing error, the altering including reducing a quality of video filtering of the presentation and reducing a quality of audio decoding of the presentation, wherein the portion of the presentation comprises at least one succeeding sample to the two or more samples.

More particularly, Applicant respectfully submits that Subramanian in view of Griffiths does not teach or suggest “requesting...a second component of the pipeline to alter the manner in which the second component processes a portion of the presentation..., the altering including reducing a quality of video filtering of the presentation and reducing a quality of audio decoding of the presentation,” as presently recited in Claim 1 (emphasis added). Further, Applicant submits that the above recitation is newly recited in Claim 1 and, therefore, has not been officially rejected. Further still, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Subramanian and Griffiths is completely silent with respect to the above recitation.

**[0009]** For instance, the Examiner cited portions of Subramanian disclose that “[t]he video decoder **230** can compare the PTS value of every B-picture **121** (note that the

PTS and DTS values of B pictures are the same) provided for decoding to the current STC value” and “[i]f the PTS value and the STC value differ by more than a predetermined threshold, the video decoder **230** drops the B-picture **121** without decoding” (paragraph [0049]). Furthermore, the Examiner-cited portions of Griffiths disclose that if “the computer **20** is too slow to play all the frames of video data **202** and there is no immediate hope of catching up to the audio data **200**,” then “a frame of video data **202** is eventually dropped in order to make up the difference in time between the audio and the video” (Col. 18, lines 28-33). That is, Subramanian and Griffiths disclose “drops the B-picture **121** without decoding” and “a frame of video data **202** is eventually dropped,” respectively.

**[0010]** In contrast, independent Claim 1 recites that “the altering including reducing a quality of video filtering of the presentation and reducing a quality of audio decoding of the presentation.” Furthermore, Applicant has reviewed the Examiner-cited references and respectfully submits that Subramanian and Griffiths both fail to teach or suggest the above recitation. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 1 is patentable over Subramanian and Griffiths, both singularly and in combination with one another.

#### Independent Claims 20, 32, 42, and 47

**[0011]** Independent Claims 20, 32, 42, and 47 recite features similar to those discussed above with regard to independent Claim 1, which is patentable over Subramanian and Griffiths for at least the foregoing reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 20, 32, 42, and 47 are also patentable

over Subramanian and Griffiths, both singularly and in combination with one another, for at least the reasons set forth above.

Dependent Claims 2-4, 7-19, 21-31, 33-41, 43-46, and 48-57

**[0012]** As stated above, independent Claims 1, 20, 32, 42, and 47 are patentable over Subramanian in view of Griffiths. Accordingly, dependent Claims 2-4, 7-19, 21-31, 33-41, 43-46, and 48-57 are also patentable over the above combination of references by virtue of their dependency on independent Claims 1, 20, 32, 42, and 47, as well as for the additional features that Claims 2-4, 7-19, 21-31, 33-41, 43-46, and 48-57 recite.

**[0013]** Thus, Subramanian and Griffiths, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that they can be combined), fail to disclose or suggest the recitations of independent Claims 1, 20, 32, 42, and 47. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1, 20, 32, 42, and 47 are patentable over the proposed combination of references. Furthermore, dependent Claims 2-4, 7-19, 21-31, 33-41, 43-46, and 48-57 are also patentable over the above combination of references by virtue of their dependency on independent Claims 1, 20, 32, 42, and 47, as well as for the additional features that each claim recites. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

**[0014]** Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-4 and 7-57 are not obvious over Subramanian in view of Griffiths, and therefore, the present rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**

**[0015]** For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-4 and 7-57 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and an early notice of allowance.

**[0016]** The arguments and amendments presented herein were necessitated by the most recent Office Action and because Applicant earnestly believed that the claims were in condition for allowance at the time of filing the previous response. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, **Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representative for Applicant

/Brett J. Schlameus/ \_\_\_\_\_ Dated: September 29, 2009  
Brett J. Schlameus (brett@leehayes.com; 206-876-6022)  
Registration No. 60827

Reviewer/Supervisor: Robert C. Peck (robp@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)  
Registration No. 56826